

QUESTIONS FOR ANSWERS ON THE DAY

(but not taken up)

PROMOTIONAL GRADES OF LANGUAGE PANDITS OF HIGH SCHOOLS.

***Q.—546. SRI V. S. LAKSHMIKANTHAPPA (Sagar).—**

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(a) whether the promotional grades of language pandits of High Schools in the State have been sanctioned and if so when ;

(b) whether it has been made applicable to all High Schools including Government High Schools ;

(c) if not already made applicable to Government High Schools, whether it would be done now ?

A.—SRI S. R. KANTHI (Minister for Education).—

(a) Yes, only in respect of Municipal and District Board High Schools.

(b) No. It is made applicable to Local Body High Schools only.

(c) This is under consideration.

CHANGE OF S.S.L.C. EXAMINATION CENTRE.

***Q.—673. SRI N. O. SAMAJI (Belgaum-II).—**

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(a) whether the S.S.L.C. students of Swami Vivekananda High School, Uchagaon in Belgaum Taluk are required to attend for their S.S.L.C. examination the Vidya Samvardhak High School, Nippani which has been selected as the examination Centre ;

(b) whether they are aware that the distance between the two places is 56 miles and the students are put to much inconvenience thereby ;

(c) whether representations were made on 3rd January 1966, 27th January 1966 and 9th March 1966 to change the Centre from Nippani to Beynon Smith High School, Belgaum ;

(d) why the Department has not taken any action to change the Centre inspite of representations ;

(e) whether Government would take immediate action to change the Centre from Nippani to Belgaum ?

A.—SRI S. R. KANTHI (Minister for Education).—

(a) No.

(b), (c), (d) and (e) Do not arise.

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

ON SRI GOPALA GOWDA'S POINT OF PROCEDURE TO BE
ADOPTED FOR DEMAND AND CUT MOTIONS.

MR. SPEAKER.—There is the point raised by the Hon'ble Member who is not present here today and for whose presence I was waiting and that is regarding the procedure that is followed on the debate relating to the Budget. Have all the members read the note I gave in this connection? I cannot hold it over today. When the Hon'ble Sri Gopala Gowda was participating in the discussion on a particular Demand and before he resumed his seat, despite the references given to him, he said that he was not satisfied. He further said that if the observation from the Chair on a prior occasion is a mere observation and not a ruling, it was not correct to follow that. He also said that even if it was a ruling, it was in conflict with the provisions of the rules that are framed. The Hon'ble Member Sri Muckannappa raised the point that if there was conflict between the rules and convention, which should prevail and he reinforced his argument by saying that I had made an observation as a Speaker that in such an event the rules should prevail and not the convention. These are all associated matters where considerable confusion has been created. The budget has developed over the centuries to such an extent that it is not possible to follow meticulously the detailed procedure that has been followed in the past. I have given references to show that even the Demands are not separately moved but only one Demand is moved and the other Demand put down for the day are deemed to have been moved. Repeating it merely consumes time without any purpose. Therefore the Chair can put the Demands straightaway without cut motions being moved. That is the ruling given by my most learned predecessor, Sri S. R. Kanthi. A very detailed ruling has been given by him on this point. To construe it, as a mere observation is not proper. That was the first session after the States Reorganisation and it was a unanimous decision of the House that this particular procedure should be followed with advantage to

9.30 A.M.

everybody concerned. Because the time that would otherwise be consumed by the Minister reading the Demands and the Chair reading the Demands, will be saved by this procedure for better purpose